

# United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/702,325	11/06/2003	Sampsa Fabritius	KOLS.063PA	2420	
40581	7590 08/10/2005		EXAMINER		
CRAWFORD MAUNU PLLC 1270 NORTHLAND DRIVE, SUITE 390			CHARIOUI,	CHARIOUI, MOHAMED	
ST. PAUL, 1		390	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
J			2857		
			DATE MAIL ED. 09/10/2004	DATE MAIL ED: 09/10/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/702,325	FABRITIUS ET AL.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Mohamed Charioui	2857				
 Period for	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	opears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
Status							
1)⊠ R	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>18 May 2005</u> .						
	,						
-							
C	losed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.				
Dispositio	n of Claims						
5)□ C 6)図 C 7)□ C	<u></u>						
Application Papers							
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
	D)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority un	der 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
Attachment(s)							
2)  Notice of 3)  Informa	of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) tion Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 lo(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da  5) Notice of Informal P  6) Other:					

Application/Control Number: 10/702,325 Page 2

Art Unit: 2857

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9, 10, 13, 14, 16, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bauman et al. (U.S. 5,875,119).

As per claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 9, 10, 13, 16, 19 and 20, Bauman et al. teach A collecting system for collecting operational information on a closed system comprising at least one of the following components configured to be monitored: a processor, a memory, peripheral equipment, an interface logic (see col. 3, lines 50-62), wherein the collecting system further comprises at least one instrument to be functionally connected to the monitor-able component of the closed system and being configured to collect operational information on at least one of the components (see col. 4, lines 7-30), and a data collector comprising at least one register and being configured to receive operational information collected by the instrument, the register being configured to store said operational information (see col. 4, lines 30-51).

As per claims 6, 7 and 14, Bauman et al. further teach that the instrument is configured to store the operational information (see col. 4, lines 17-30).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3, 8, 11, 12, 15, 17, 18 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bauman et al. in view of Blaauw et al. (U.S. 6,819,538).

Bauman et al. teach the system as stated above except adjusting the performance and /or power consumption of the closed system in response to analysis information received from the analyzing module.

Blaauw et al. teach this feature (see col. 10, lines 12-30 and col. 10, lines 52-56). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Blaauw et al.'s teaching into Bauman et al.'s invention because it would provide adjustment of the power consumption of the system. Therefore damage to the system would be prevented and proper operation of the system would be ensured.

## Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 5/18/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the system do not collect data in a close system.

Examiner sees Bauman et al. reference does teach collecting data inside the system (i.e. "the performance monitor may be integrated into an ASIC 110) (see col. 4, lines 7-16). Therefore, Examiner considers that the system is a close system.

Applicant argues that if the monitoring system is integrated inside the closed system such as ASIC, it would be impossible to determine locations of the black spots.

Examiner do not find in the claim limitation determine locations of the black spots. Therefore, Examiner sees that the rejection of the claims over Bauman et al. reference is proper.

## Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

## **Contact information**

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mohamed Charioui whose telephone number is (571) 272-2213. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday, from 9 am to 6 pm.

Application/Control Number: 10/702,325

Art Unit: 2857

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Marc S Hoff can be reached on (571) 272-2216. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mohamed Charioui

8/3/05

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECH!:OLOGY CE!:TER 2800 Page 5